



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/967,221

09/28/2001

James Morrow

83336.0519

7155

66880 7590 07/11/2011

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, LLP
2121 AVENUE OF THE STARS
SUITE 2800
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER

THOMAS, ERIC M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/11/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

emiyake@steptoe.com
mhein@ballytech.com
ccipdocketing@steptoe.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/967,221	Applicant(s) MORROW ET AL.	
	Examiner ERIC M. THOMAS	Art Unit 3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-138 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-138 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This is in response to the amendments/arguments filed on 4/22/11. Claims 1 – 138 are pending in the current application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 - 138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven et al. (US 5,429,361) in view of Paulsen (U.S. 2002/0193099).

Regarding Claims 1, 16 - 18, 26, 41-44, 68-69, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, Raven et al. discloses a gaming machine information, communication, and display system for automating maintenance, accounting, security, player tracking, event recording, player interaction, and other functions for a plurality of gaming machines. The system has a display and data entry means for a player or employee to interact with the system. Furthermore, in addition to gaming functions, the system downloads data from the central data processor to each individual gaming machine. Raven et al. lacks explicitly disclosing; integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming platform screen used to display the gaming information. Raven et al. discloses one way a player or employee interacts with the system is by

Art Unit: 3714

pressing buttons on a keypad, whereas, in the instant invention, a touch-screen input is utilized to interface with the system. Interaction with a gaming system, whether by keypad input or touch-screen, provides the same function to the overall system.

Raven is silent on the issue of the system including a touch screen and displaying non-gaming system information wherein an interface allows a player to input requests into the system network. In a related art, however, Paulsen discloses a personal gaming device, (abstract), wherein the device is adapted to present a game to player, (par. 0005), wherein the display screen of the gaming device includes touch screen input, (par. 0021), wherein a player or user of the gaming device may utilize the device to access a wide variety of information and services, wherein the player may make room or restaurant reservations and obtain hotel/casino information (par. 0074).

The examiner views this as a systems interface that incorporated into the display screen of the gaming platform, wherein the systems interface displays non-gaming system information from a system network through the gaming machine to a casino player or employee, wherein the system interface may be operable to produce system request capabilities. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Paulsen into the art disclosed by Raven in order to provide a transaction system utilizing touch-screen technology into the wagering game, which is attractive to game players and casino personnel and requires less maintenance than mechanical push buttons.

Regarding claims 2, 19, 45, 86, 103 – 105, 115, 117, 121, and 122, Raven provides a gaming system wherein the player inserts a card into a card of the

Art Unit: 3714

gaming machine wherein the gaming will prompt the player by means on the display to enter his/her pin number via a keypad, (col. 10, lines 47 - 53). The examiner views this as an identification card that may have embedded information, wherein once the player inserts the card into the gaming machine it activates the systems interface on the display screen.

Regarding claims 3 – 5, 22 – 24, 34 – 37, 46, and 48 – 50, 61, 63, 64, 72, 73, 94, 96, 97, 118, and 120, Raven provides a gaming system that discloses a control unit that includes a card reader and employee/player communications are desired (col. 2, lines 29 - 36). This is viewed by the examiner as the gaming system having an interface system that includes player and employee services that is accessible by an identification card inserted into the gaming device, wherein the employee may use to access the MASTERCOM control unit of the gaming system that may include game information, game monitoring, and account meters.

Regarding Claims 6, 38, 65, 74, and 98, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, utilizing a Y adapter to allow communication to a plurality of devices was well known. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to utilize a Y adapter that allows communication between the display screen and both the at least one processor and the additional processor. One would be motivated to utilize a Y adapter to allow communication between the display and one of the processors because a Y adapter provides a simple solution to switching communication from one processor to the other, thereby, allowing the system to eliminate at least one redundant connection

Art Unit: 3714

between the display and one of the processors.

Regarding Claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, calibration software and hardware for a computer display were notoriously well known in the art.

Regarding Claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, 116, Raven discloses a gaming machine information, communication, and display system for automating maintenance, accounting, security, player tracking, event recording, player interaction, and other functions for a plurality of gaming machines, but Raven is silent on the issue of gaming interface that allows a player to view and participate in the wagering through the display screen and whether the gaming machine produces enhanced graphics and animation display for interactions with the system network. As stated above, however, Paulsen discloses a personal gaming device, (abstract), wherein the device is adapted to present a game to player, (par. 0005), wherein the display screen of the gaming device includes touch screen input, (par. 0021), wherein a player or user of the gaming device may utilize the device to access a wide variety of information and services, wherein the player may make room or restaurant reservations and obtain hotel/casino information (par. 0074). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Paulsen into the art disclosed by Raven in order to provide a transaction system utilizing touch-screen technology into the wagering game, which is attractive to game players and casino personnel and requires less maintenance than mechanical push buttons.

Art Unit: 3714

Regarding claims 9, 25, 32, 33, 51 – 53, 59, 60, 93, 107, 123, 124, 131, and 132, Raven provides a gaming system that includes a control unit called MASTERCOM, a DMK unit, and a main computer, wherein these elements are the primary hardware elements of the gaming system, wherein the term MASTERCOM is derived from its functions: Maintenance, Accounting, Security, player Tracking, Event Recorder, and Communicator, wherein the DMK unit is the interface and communications device between a player or employee and the MASTERCOM, wherein both of these elements are controlled by a processor, wherein the system also includes an EEPROM that is used for storing accounting meters, wherein the information stored may be a list of parameters containing addresses, coin denomination, limits and other characteristics that vary from one gaming machine and/or casino to another (col. 2, line 29 —col. 3, line 20). This is viewed by the examiner as the gaming system utilizing a multiple processor platform, wherein at least one processor supports the hardware applications, wherein at least one processor runs game controlling peripherals, game logic, and rules necessary to generate a wagering game on the display of the gaming device, and at least one processor that provides access to system information on a system network via the systems interface.

Regarding claims 10 – 15, 21, 27 – 31, 39, 47, 54 – 58, 71, 76 - 82, 85, 87 - 92, 106, 108 – 113, 116, 119, 125 – 130, Raven provides a gaming system that includes a display and input system, but is silent on the issue of the gaming including a touch screen. As stated above, however, Paulsen discloses a personal gaming device, (abstract), wherein the device is adapted to present a game to player, (par. 0005),

Art Unit: 3714

wherein the display screen of the gaming device includes touch screen input, (par. 0021), wherein a player or user of the gaming device may utilize the device to access a wide variety of information and services, wherein the player may make room or restaurant reservations and obtain hotel/casino information (par. 0074). The examiner views the touch screen of Paulsen as being capable of having a small region that is selectable by a user that may show messages to the user once the user touches the screen to select one of the goods and services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Paulsen into the art disclosed by Raven in order to provide a transaction system utilizing touch-screen technology into the wagering game, which is attractive to game players and casino personnel and requires less maintenance than mechanical push buttons.

Regarding Claims 40, 67, and 134, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, it would have been obvious that integrating the systems interface via the display screen would lower overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduce maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts. Reducing overall costs by eliminating hardware and reducing maintenance costs are a byproduct of modernizing an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding claims 62, 95, and 133, Raven provides a gaming system that may include a network interface card (col. 2, lines 44 - 46).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 4/2/11 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 1, Applicants argue that "the Paulsen reference provides no disclosure whatsoever as to how its "system information" (e.g., hotel/casino information) would be made available to a user." It is further argued that "there are many ways for the player to use the "personal gaming device" to make a room, show or restaurant reservation and obtain hotel/casino information that do not involve use of the gaming display screen", and furthermore it is argued that "none of the cited references disclose system information being displayed through the gaming interface display screen." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Regarding argument number one, par. 0054 of Paulsen discloses that "upon a personal gaming device establishing a communication link with the personal gaming device interface, the menu information may be transmitted to the personal gaming device for display thereon." The Examiner views this as clearly reading on the limitation of the "system information" being available to the user.

2. Regarding the argument of "personal gaming device" to make a room, show or restaurant reservation and obtain hotel/casino information that do not involve use of the gaming display screen", wherein the Applicants point to par. 0023 of Paulsen to justify this, while the Examiner does not dispute this, but this is just one embodiment taught by Paulsen. The Examiner points to points to par. 0006, wherein it is disclosed that the personal gaming device includes a wireless communication interface, wherein this interface is adapted to receive and transmit data. This is further taught in par. 0039,

Art Unit: 3714

wherein it is disclosed that the personal gaming device interface, (part 62 of fig. 3), serves as a gateway to data communications between the personal gaming device, (part 20 of fig. 3), and various networks, servers, and other devices, wherein as disclosed in par. 0053, that once this communication link is provided, data may be transmitted to and from the personal gaming device. As stated above, disclosed in par. 0054, "upon a personal gaming device establishing a communication link with the personal gaming device interface, the menu information may be transmitted to the personal gaming device for display thereon", wherein a player may select one or more activities or functions from the displayed menu, wherein input may be provided by touching an area of the screen associated with a menu item, wherein an example is made wherein the player may be permitted to obtain show, ticket, hotel information, and place reservations, as disclosed in par. 0055. The Examiner views this as clearly reading on the argued limitation.

3. Regarding the argument of "none of the cited references disclose system information being displayed through the gaming interface display screen." The Examiner views the arguments and citations above as also reading on this limitation.

4. Regarding claims 21, 47, and 119, Applicants argue that "none of the cited references teach or suggest a player service interface provides player access to service features including ordering beverages and receiving change." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Paulsen discloses in par. 0070, that a player may be permitted to access a wide variety of goods or services using the personal gaming device. The Examiner

Art Unit: 3714

views the goods or services as being equivalent to ordering beverages and receiving change.

5. Regarding the arguments of claims 10 – 13, 27 – 30, 54 – 57, 77 – 80, 108 – 111, and 125 - 128, Applications arguments are similar to the arguments of claim 1, which argues the “system information” being available to the user, wherein this is addressed and cited above.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIC M. THOMAS whose telephone number is (571)272-1699. The examiner can normally be reached on 7a.m. - 3p.m.

Art Unit: 3714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Lewis can be reached on (571) 272-7673. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/E. M. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/DAVID L LEWIS/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714